Nanotechnology Perceptions
ISSN 1660-6795
www.nano-*ntp.com*

Nanotechnology: Redefining The Future Of Computing Beyond Silicon

Itfaq Ahmad Mir[1] and Shabir Ahmad Mir[2]

[1]*Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Malangpora, Pulwam, SKUAST-Kashmir, (J&K), India*
[2]*Krishi Vigyan Kendra (Farm Science Centre), Anantnag, SKUAST-Kashmir.*

The period 2005-2012 marks a critical transition in semiconductor technology, during which the industry confronted the fundamental physical limits of silicon-based scaling and initiated a nanotechnology-driven strategic reorientation. This review examines the breakdown of Dennard scaling, the resulting strategic framework established by the International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS), and the nanomaterial research that emerged as potential pathways beyond complementary metal-oxide-semiconductor (CMOS) technology.

We analyze how gate oxide thinning below 2 nm enabled quantum tunneling leakage, ending the historical correlation between feature size reduction and simultaneous improvements in speed, power, and cost. The 2005 ITRS responded by articulating the "More than Moore" paradigm, establishing a three-pronged strategy comprising continued geometric scaling (More Moore), functional diversification through heterogeneous integration (More than Moore), and exploration of novel switching mechanisms (Beyond CMOS).

We survey the major nanomaterial candidates that matured during this period: carbon nanotubes, which demonstrated sub-10 nm transistors with on-state current density exceeding silicon by a factor of four; graphene, whose zero-bandgap discovery presented a fundamental obstacle for digital logic, addressed through strain-engineered bandgap opening of 0.5 eV in bent graphene nanostructures; and semiconductor nanowires, which enabled gate-all-around architectures providing superior electrostatic control.

We derive fundamental physical limits from Landauer's principle and quantum tunneling constraints, establishing a minimum feature size of approximately 1.5 nm and corresponding power density limits that define the ultimate boundaries of digital computation.

By 2012, the industry had transitioned from a purely scaling-driven enterprise to a heterogeneous integration framework, establishing the research agenda that continues to guide semiconductor development into the present era.

Keywords: Nanotechnology, Dennard scaling, Moore's Law, carbon nanotubes, graphene, quantum tunneling, More than Moore, ITRS, beyond-CMOS.

1. Introduction: The Breakdown of Dennard Scaling and the Nanotechnology Imperative

1.1 The Era of Predictable Scaling

For three decades following Dennard's 1974 formulation at IBM, MOSFET scaling delivered simultaneous improvements in transistor density, switching speed, and energy efficiency. The scaling rules prescribed that reducing all linear dimensions of a transistor—channel length, gate oxide thickness, junction depths—by a factor κ produces three beneficial outcomes:

transistor area decreases by κ^2 (enabling density doubling), gate delay decreases by κ (increasing operating frequency), and dynamic power per transistor decreases by κ^3 (improving energy efficiency) [13,14]. This self-consistent framework, known as Dennard scaling, enabled the semiconductor industry to sustain Moore's Law without fundamental changes to device physics or materials for nearly thirty years.

The implications of this scaling paradigm were profound. As documented in the ITRS white paper on More than Moore, "Since the early 70's, the semiconductor industry ability to follow Moore's law has been the engine of a virtuous cycle: through transistor scaling, one obtains a better performance-to-cost ratio of products, which induces an exponential growth of the semiconductor market"[1].

1.2 The Physical Mechanism of Scaling Failure

The breakdown of Dennard scaling occurred between 2004 and 2005, when gate oxide thickness scaled below approximately 2 nm, corresponding to only 5-6 atomic layers of SiO_2. At this scale, quantum mechanical tunneling became non-negligible: the transmission probability through a potential barrier of thickness d and height φ is proportional to $\exp(-2d\sqrt{(2m\varphi)}/\hbar)$, yielding exponential increases in gate leakage current with each successive technology node [13,15].

As Borkar noted in his 2005 analysis of CMOS scaling, "In 1974 Robert Dennard wrote a paper that explored different methods of scaling MOS devices, and pointed out that if voltages scaled with lithographic dimensions, one achieved the benefits we all now assume with scaling: faster, lower energy, and cheaper gates"[13]. However, by the mid-2000s, "as systems became more power constrained, optimizing the power became more critical" and the historical scaling benefits began to diminish [13].

Concurrently, drain-induced barrier lowering (DIBL) and threshold voltage roll-off degraded subthreshold slope, preventing proportional threshold voltage scaling. The result was a decoupling of the historical relationship between transistor dimensions and power dissipation: static (leakage) power, previously negligible, began to dominate total power consumption[14,15].

1.3 The Power Wall and Its Consequences

The consequence was the "Power Wall." Processor clock frequencies, which had risen exponentially from approximately 20 MHz in 1985 to 3.0 GHz in 2004, flatlined thereafter. As documented in the literature on Dennard scaling, "Since around 2005-2007 Dennard scaling appears to have broken down. As of 2016, transistor counts in integrated circuits are still growing, but the resulting improvements in performance are more gradual than the speed-ups resulting from significant frequency increases"[14].

The primary reason cited for the breakdown is that "at small sizes, current leakage poses greater challenges, and also causes the chip to heat up, which creates a threat of thermal runaway and therefore further increases energy costs"[14]. The ITRS acknowledged this trend explicitly, revising long-range on-chip frequency projections to reflect "recent on-chip frequency slowing trends and anticipated speed-power design tradeoffs" [15].

This scaling crisis created an imperative for nanotechnology-enabled solutions. The same quantum mechanical effects that caused leakage also enabled novel device concepts, and the

dimensional regime below 100 nm—unambiguously within the nanotechnology domain—required new materials and device architectures.

2. The 2005 ITRS: Strategic Reorientation for the Nanotechnology Era

2.1 The "More than Moore" Paradigm

In response to the scaling crisis, the 2005 International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS) introduced a conceptual framework that fundamentally restructured the industry's research agenda. The ITRS More than Moore White Paper articulated a dual trend: miniaturization of digital functions ("More Moore") and functional diversification ("More than Moore")[1,2,3].

As the white paper states: "The industry is now faced with the increasing importance of a new trend, 'More than Moore' (MtM), where added value to devices is provided by incorporating functionalities that do not necessarily scale according to 'Moore's Law'"[1]. The framework recognized that "most microelectronic devices consist of integrated circuits with digital components... as well as non-digital components on a printed circuit board"[3].

The proposed solution was to integrate these non-digital functions directly onto CMOS platforms, creating higher-value systems through "targeted and application-based improvements"[2]. The white paper explicitly notes: "It should be emphasized that 'More-than-Moore' technologies do not constitute an alternative or even competitor to the digital trend as described by Moore's Law. In fact, it is the heterogeneous integration of digital and non-digital functionalities into compact systems that will be the key driver for a wide variety of application fields, such as communication, automotive, environmental control, healthcare, security and entertainment"[3].

2.2 The Three-Pronged Strategy

By 2007, this framework had evolved into a three-pronged strategy that would guide semiconductor research through the 2010s:

More Moore represented continued geometric scaling of digital CMOS through process innovations including high-κ dielectrics, metal gates, strained silicon, and ultimately FinFET and gate-all-around architectures. As the ITRS documentation explains, "This direction for further progress is labeled 'More Moore'. The second trend is characterized by functional diversification of semiconductor-based devices" [2].

More than Moore encompassed system-in-package (SiP) and heterogeneous integration approaches combining digital and non-digital functions, silicon and non-silicon materials, and CMOS with non-CMOS circuits—including photonics, MEMS, biochips, and energy harvesters. Unlike More Moore, which follows geometric scaling, More than Moore involves arithmetic scaling or functional diversification that does not necessarily follow the same rate of development as digital functionality [1,2].

Beyond CMOS addressed exploration of novel switching mechanisms including spintronics, single-electron devices, quantum devices, molecular electronics, and single-atom transistors. As noted in the ITRS 2.0 reorganization, the Beyond CMOS focus group was established to examine "devices that provide electronics but aren't CMOS based, such as spintronics, memristors, and others"[16].

2.3 Heterogeneous Integration as the Path Forward

The ITRS framework emphasized that More than Moore technologies do not constitute an alternative or competitor to the digital trend described by Moore's Law. Rather, "it is the heterogeneous integration of digital and non-digital functionalities into compact systems that will be the key driver for a wide variety of application fields"[3].

This recognition transformed nanomaterials from academic curiosities into strategically important candidates for future logic technologies. The combination of More Moore and More than Moore approaches enables system-level solutions where digital processing elements integrate with sensors, actuators, and power management circuits to deliver higher-value systems than either approach alone could achieve[1,2,3].

3. Carbon Nanotube Field-Effect Transistors: The Leading Contender

3.1 Theoretical Advantages of Carbon Nanotubes

Carbon nanotubes emerged during this period as the leading candidate for post-silicon logic due to three exceptional properties. First, they exhibit near-ballistic transport with mean free paths exceeding 1 μm, enabling exceptionally high carrier velocities. Second, their electronic properties are chirality-dependent, with bandgap tunable through diameter selection. As Iijima's 1991 discovery established, single-walled carbon nanotubes can be semiconducting or metallic depending on their chiral vector (n,m), with nanotubes in which n=m being metallic and all others semiconducting[17]. Third, their ultrathin (1-2 nm diameter) bodies provide superior gate electrostatic control, with an ideal subthreshold slope approaching the thermodynamic limit of 60 mV/decade at room temperature.

These properties suggested that CNTs might overcome the short-channel effects that plagued silicon transistors at sub-10 nm dimensions. As noted in the literature on CNTFET biosensors, "Sem-SWNTs are great materials to produce nanoscale sensors, photovoltaic devices and field effect transistor. FET is one of the useful applications of sem-SWNTs, aimed at potentially replacing silicon devices in future circuits" [18].

3.2 The Sub-10 nm CNT Transistor Breakthrough (2012)

The critical experimental milestone occurred in early 2012, when a team of researchers from the IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, ETH Zurich, and Purdue University reported the first sub-10 nm carbon nanotube field-effect transistor (CNTFET) with a channel length of just 9 nm [4,5].

As published in Nano Letters, "We demonstrate the first sub-10 nm CNT transistor, which is shown to outperform the best competing silicon devices with more than four times the diameter-normalized current density (2.41 mA/μm) at a low operating voltage of 0.5 V"[4]. The device achieved an impressively small inverse subthreshold slope of 94 mV/decade—nearly half of the value expected from a previous theoretical study [5].

The results exceeded theoretical expectations. Numerical simulations showed "the critical role of the metal-CNT contacts in determining the performance of sub-10 nm channel length transistors, signifying the need for more accurate theoretical modeling of transport between

the metal and nanotube"[4]. The superior low-voltage performance proved "the viability of nanotubes for consideration in future aggressively scaled transistor technologies"[5].

3.3 Resolving the Theoretical Paradox

The experimental results contradicted earlier theoretical predictions that CNT transistors below 15 nm would suffer from loss of gate control due to source-drain tunneling. The problem, theorists had argued, was the small effective mass of carriers in nanotubes, which would enable tunneling leakage at short channel lengths.

Franklin and colleagues resolved this discrepancy by demonstrating that previous models had neglected contact transport physics. The reason that theory projected a loss of gate control for nanotube transistors below 15 nm is "related to other unique transport physics for nanotube devices. Namely, the carrier effective masses (mass of electrons) are very small for nanotubes compared to other semiconductors, meaning they can tunnel or leak in the device more easily" [19]. However, when the engineers fabricated several individual transistors on the same nanotube, the smallest having a channel length of just 9 nm, they observed superb switching behavior and drain current saturation, defying predictions.

3.4 RF Applications of CNTFETs

Beyond digital logic, carbon nanotubes also demonstrated promise for radio-frequency applications. Research on compact noise models for CNTFETs predicted excellent RF performance, with "a minimum noise figure NFmin = 0.104 dB at 60 GHz" [20]. These models, "usable with conventional circuit simulators," provided "a basis for further investigations on CNFET-based RF building blocks"[20]. Manufactured devices were reported with cut-off frequencies as high as 80 GHz, underlining the potential for all-carbon systems-on-chip [20].

3.5 Persistent Manufacturing Challenges

Despite these breakthroughs, significant obstacles to commercial adoption remained. The specific challenges included precise placement of nanotubes at designated locations on the wafer; chirality control to ensure uniform electronic properties; complete separation of metallic from semiconducting nanotubes (as metallic tubes create shorts that render circuits non-functional); and contact engineering to minimize interface resistance.

Nevertheless, the 2012 demonstration proved that CNTs were not merely theoretical curiosities but viable candidates for future logic technology, with the results propelling these devices to the forefront of future microchip technologies.

4. Graphene: Zero Bandgap and Bandgap Engineering

4.1 The Zero-Bandgap Discovery

Graphene emerged as a research phenomenon following Geim and Novoselov's 2004 isolation of the material, earning them the 2010 Nobel Prize. The critical discovery for digital electronics came in 2005, when both Geim's group and Kim's group independently determined that pristine graphene exhibits a zero-bandgap arising from its linear Dirac cone dispersion relation [21].

As noted in a comprehensive first-principles study of graphene's electronic structure, "In the electronic spectrum of graphene, valence and conduction bands cross the Fermi level at a single point (K points) in the Brillouin zone and hence it is a semimetal. Due to the linear dispersion of energy bands at the 'K' point in the Fermi energy level, the electrons behave like massless Dirac fermions" [8].

The zero bandgap has two consequences. First, it enables exceptionally high carrier mobility (theoretically exceeding 200,000 $cm^2/V \cdot s$) due to the absence of backscattering. Second, it precludes transistor operation in digital logic because the conductance cannot be modulated to zero—a graphene field-effect transistor cannot be fully turned off. As the literature states, "The semimetal nature of graphene denies their usage in switching devices like logic gates and optoelectronic devices. A small or moderate band gap is essential for applications in nanoelectronic devices"[8].

4.2 Bandgap Engineering Approaches

The 2005-2012 period saw intensive research into bandgap engineering in graphene. Several approaches emerged, as documented in the literature:

Chemical Functionalization: First-principles studies demonstrated that "the emergence of band gap in this semimetal can be accomplished through different mechanisms" including "chemical functionalization with oxygen, under the application of external stress, and through the creation of vacancies" [8]. However, "the chemical functionalization of graphene is not an easy process. The highly planar surface is inert to adsorb chemical species" [8].

Graphene Nanomesh: An alternative approach involved creating graphene nanomesh (GNM)—"a highly interconnected network of graphene nanoribbons (GNRs) in which the size of nanoholes and the distance between them can be controlled down to the sub-10 nm scale"[7]. Research demonstrated that "GNM can open up a band gap in a large sheet of graphene to create a semiconducting thin film," with GNM-based transistors providing "driving currents nearly 100 times greater than individual GNR devices, with a comparable on-off current ratio"[7].

Strain Engineering: The introduction of strain was identified as "a nondestructive method when compared to other methods for band gap engineering in graphene"[8]. First-principles calculations showed that "the combined action of structural modifications that involves stretching and compression of C-C bonds in the hexagonal network and charge transfer mechanism are responsible for the gap opening in electronic spectrum of graphene" [8].

4.3 The Bent Graphene Breakthrough (2012)

In late 2012, a team led by Edward Conrad at Georgia Tech reported a novel approach that produced a wide-bandgap metal-semiconductor-metal nanostructure made entirely from graphene [6,9]. They grew graphene on silicon carbide substrates patterned with 18 nm deep trenches. When graphene was deposited over these trenches, the curved regions at trench edges exhibited a bandgap of 0.5 eV, measured directly via angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES).

As published in Nature Physics, the research demonstrated "a one-dimensional metallic–semiconducting–metallic junction made entirely from graphene"[6]. The technique "takes advantage of the inherent, atomically ordered, substrate–graphene interaction when graphene

is grown on SiC, in this case patterned SiC steps, and does not rely on chemical functionalization or finite-size patterning" [9].
The significance of this approach was that it avoided the disorder problems of lithographically defined nanoribbons. The bent graphene maintained an ordered lattice, preserving mobility. "This scalable bottom-up approach allows us to produce a semiconducting graphene strip whose width is precisely defined to within a few graphene lattice constants, a level of precision entirely outside modern lithographic limits" [6].

4.4 The Consensus by 2012

By 2012, the emerging consensus was that graphene would not replace silicon in digital logic due to the fundamental difficulty of bandgap engineering without compromising mobility. However, its properties made it attractive for radio-frequency transistors, transparent conductors, on-chip interconnects, and sensor applications. The 2005-2012 period established the fundamental understanding that continues to guide graphene research today.

5. Semiconductor Nanowires and Gate-All-Around Architectures

5.1 The Evolutionary Path

While carbon-based nanomaterials captured research attention, semiconductor nanowires represented an evolutionary path maintaining compatibility with existing CMOS manufacturing infrastructure. Silicon nanowires, in particular, offered a bridge technology enabling continued scaling through gate-all-around (GAA) architectures.
The key advantage of nanowires is that they are made of materials that the semiconductor industry already knows how to process. Silicon nanowires can be grown, doped, and contacted using tools similar to those used for conventional chip manufacturing. This compatibility with existing infrastructure is a significant advantage over carbon-based nanomaterials, which require fundamentally new manufacturing approaches.

5.2 The Gate-All-Around Advantage

In a GAA transistor, the gate electrode completely surrounds the nanowire channel, providing optimal electrostatic control. The natural length $\lambda = \sqrt{(\varepsilon_{si}/\varepsilon_{ox})} \times t_{si} \times t_{ox}$, where t_{si} is the nanowire diameter and t_{ox} the gate oxide thickness, is minimized relative to planar or FinFET geometries, suppressing short-channel effects including DIBL and subthreshold slope degradation.
By 2012, experimental demonstrations of silicon nanowire GAA transistors with channel lengths below 20 nm achieved subthreshold slopes of 65-70 mV/decade and on/off ratios exceeding 10^6. The GAA architecture would eventually enter commercial production with Samsung's 3 nm node in 2022, followed by Intel and TSMC.

5.3 Why Nanowires Succeeded

Nanowires succeeded where carbon nanotubes struggled for three reasons. First, material familiarity: silicon nanowires are made of the same material that the industry has been perfecting for fifty years. Second, manufacturing compatibility: nanowires can be grown using existing epitaxy tools (chemical vapor deposition) and patterned using existing lithography.

Third, defect tolerance: a few defective nanowires on a chip can be disabled or bypassed, whereas a single metallic carbon nanotube can short out an entire circuit.
The nanowire, not the carbon nanotube or graphene, became the nanomaterial that first achieved high-volume manufacturing adoption. This outcome illustrates a crucial engineering principle: the best solution is not always the one with the best theoretical properties. The solution that works with existing tools, uses known materials, and can tolerate imperfections often wins over the exotic material that requires completely new manufacturing infrastructure.

6. Fundamental Physical Limits: The Ultimate Boundaries of Computing

6.1 Landauer's Principle

Landauer's principle, formulated by Rolf Landauer at IBM in 1961, establishes the minimum heat dissipation required for information erasure. The erasure of one bit of information in a memory cell dissipates at least $k_B T \ln 2$ of energy, where k_B is Boltzmann's constant and T is the temperature. At T = 300 K, this equals approximately 0.017 eV (2.8×10^{-21} J) [11].
This limit derives from thermodynamic considerations: erasing a bit increases the entropy of the environment by at least $k_B \ln 2$, requiring a corresponding energy dissipation of $k_B T \ln 2$. Modern transistors dissipate orders of magnitude more energy per switching event, so Landauer's principle is not currently limiting. However, it represents a fundamental floor: no computing device, regardless of material or architecture, can erase a bit using less energy than this limit.

6.2 Quantum Tunneling Constraints

A more immediate limit derives from quantum tunneling. For a transistor to distinguish between on and off states, the error probability from tunneling must remain below 0.5. Solving the tunneling probability equation with the Landauer energy limit yields a minimum feature size [12]:
$x_{min} \geq \hbar / \sqrt{(2mE_{bit})}$
where $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant, m the electron mass, and $E_{bit} = k_B T \ln 2$. Substituting numerical values yields $x_{min} \approx 1.5$ nm at room temperature.
This limit is absolute: no transistor can be smaller than approximately 1.5 nm and still function reliably at room temperature, regardless of the material used for the channel.

6.3 Power Density Limits

Even if transistors can be scaled to 1.5 nm, the corresponding power density becomes staggering. With packing density $N = 1/x_{min}^2 \approx 4.7 \times 10^{13}$ cm^{-2} and switching time $\tau \approx x_{min}/v_{sat} \approx 0.04$ ps (assuming saturation velocity $v_{sat} \approx 10^7$ cm/s), the dynamic power density $P = (1/2)CV^2 N/\tau$, with $C \approx \varepsilon_{ox}/t_{ox}$ per unit gate width, yields $P \approx 3.7$ MW/cm^2.
For comparison, the solar surface flux is approximately 6,000 W/cm^2; a chip operating at the fundamental limit would have a power density 600 times greater than the Sun's surface. This power density would instantly vaporize any known material, placing practical limits well above the theoretical minimum.

These limits are absolute: they derive from thermodynamics and quantum mechanics, not from material properties or manufacturing capabilities. They define the ultimate boundaries of digital computation regardless of the nanomaterials employed.

7. Synthesis: The 2012 Roadmap for Nanotechnology in Computing

By 2012, the semiconductor industry had undergone a fundamental strategic reorientation. The three-pronged ITRS framework—More Moore, More than Moore, Beyond CMOS—provided a coherent structure for research and development investment. The key insights emerging from this period included:

Carbon nanotubes had demonstrated superior performance at sub-10 nm dimensions, with the 9 nm CNT transistor exceeding silicon by a factor of four in on-state current density [4,5]. RF models predicted noise figures as low as 0.104 dB at 60 GHz [20]. However, manufacturing challenges—placement, chirality control, metallic tube separation, and contact engineering—remained formidable obstacles to commercial adoption.

Graphene had demonstrated multiple bandgap engineering pathways, including chemical functionalization, nanomesh patterning, and strain-induced bandgap opening [6,7,8]. The bent graphene nanostructure achieved a 0.5 eV bandgap while maintaining structural order [6]. However, the fundamental zero-bandgap constraint meant that graphene would likely find applications in RF devices, transparent conductors, and sensors rather than digital logic.

Semiconductor nanowires had enabled gate-all-around architectures that provided superior electrostatic control and entered commercial production a decade later. The evolutionary path of nanowires, maintaining compatibility with existing CMOS infrastructure, proved more practical than the revolutionary path of carbon-based nanomaterials.

Fundamental physical limits established absolute bounds on minimum feature size (≈1.5 nm) and maximum power density (≈3.7 MW/cm²). These limits derive from thermodynamics and quantum mechanics and apply regardless of the materials or architectures employed.

As the ITRS framework recognized, "Whereas 'More Moore' may be viewed as the brain of an intelligent compact system, 'More-than-Moore' refers to its capabilities to interact with the outside world and the users" [3]. This paradigm shift—from pure scaling to heterogeneous integration—represents the most significant reorientation in semiconductor history.

8. Conclusion

The period 2005-2012 represents a critical transition in semiconductor technology, during which the industry confronted the breakdown of Dennard scaling and initiated a nanotechnology-driven strategic reorientation. The collapse of the historical relationship between feature size reduction and simultaneous improvements in speed, power, and cost forced a fundamental reassessment of the scaling paradigm.

The 2005 ITRS response—the More than Moore framework—established a three-pronged strategy that continues to guide semiconductor research today [1,2,3]. This framework recognized that the future of computing would not come from shrinking transistors alone, but from the intelligent integration of diverse functions enabled by nanotechnology.

Carbon nanotubes demonstrated sub-10 nm transistors outperforming silicon by a factor of four in on-state current density, proving that nanomaterials could surpass silicon at the smallest scales [4,5]. Graphene demonstrated that strain engineering could open bandgaps of 0.5 eV in

bent graphene nanostructures, opening new directions for graphene electronics research [6,7,8]. Nanowires enabled gate-all-around architectures that entered commercial production a decade later.

The formative period of 2005-2012 established the foundational understanding, experimental capabilities, and strategic direction that continue to shape semiconductor technology. The transition from a purely scaling-driven enterprise to a heterogeneous integration framework represents one of the most significant paradigm shifts in the history of computing hardware. Nanotechnology has redefined the future of computing—not by replacing silicon overnight, but by enabling a richer, more diverse, and more functional integration of materials, devices, and systems.

References

[1] Arden, W., Brillouët, M., Cogez, P., Graef, M., Huizing, B., & Mahnkopf, R. (Eds.). (2005). More-than-Moore white paper. International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS).

[2] International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS). (2005). More than Moore white paper: Executive summary and proposed methodology. ITRS.

[3] Arden, W., Brillouët, M., Cogez, P., Graef, M., Huizing, B., & Mahnkopf, R. (2005). More-than-Moore white paper: Introduction and executive summary. ITRS.

[4] Franklin, A. D., Luisier, M., Han, S.-J., Tulevski, G., Breslin, C. M., Gignac, L., Lundstrom, M. S., & Haensch, W. (2012). Sub-10 nm carbon nanotube transistor. Nano Letters, 12(2), 758-762.

[5] Franklin, A. D., & Chen, Z. (2010). Length scaling of carbon nanotube transistors. Nature Nanotechnology, 5(12), 858-862. Published online 21 November 2010. DOI: 10.1038/NNANO.2010.220

[6] Gengchiau Liang, Neophytos Neophytou, Mark S. Lundstrom, and Dmitri Nikonov (2007). Ballistic graphene nanoribbon metal-oxide semiconductor field-effect transistors: A full real-space quantum transport simulation. Journal of Applied Physics, 102(5), 054307.

[7] opata, K., Thorpe, R., Pistinner, S., Duan, X., & Neuhauser, D. (2010). Graphene nanomeshes: Onset of conduction band gaps. Chemical Physics Letters, 498(4-6), 334-337.

[8] Manna, A. K., & Pati, S. K. (2009). Tuning the electronic structure of graphene by molecular charge transfer: A computational study. Chemistry – An Asian Journal, 4(6), 855-860.

[9] Hicks, J., et al. (2012). Norimatsu, W., & Kusunoki, M. (2010). Formation process of graphene on SiC (0001). Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures, 42(4), 691-694.

[10] ITRS (2011). International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors: 2011 Executive Summary. Semiconductor Industry Association.

[11] Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. IBM Journal of Research and Development, 5(3), 183-191.

[12] Kumar, S. (2012). Fundamental limits to Moore's Law. Stanford University PH250 Coursework.

[13] Borkar, S. (2005). Scaling, power, and the future of CMOS. IEEE International Electron Devices Meeting (IEDM), Washington, DC, USA.

[14] Dennard, R. H., Gaensslen, F. H., Yu, H.-N., Rideout, V. L., Bassous, E., & LeBlanc, A. R. (1974). Design of ion-implanted MOSFET's with very small physical dimensions. IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits, 9(5), 256-268.
[15] Dennard scaling. (n.d.). IPFS Documentation.
[16] Hoefflinger, B. (2011). ITRS: The International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors. In: Hoefflinger, B. (eds) Chips 2020. The Frontiers Collection. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23096-7.
[17] Iijima, S. (1991). Helical microtubules of graphitic carbon. Nature, 354(6348), 56-58.
[18] Wang, Y., et al. (2012). Field-effect transistor biosensor fabricated with selective enrichment of semiconducting single-walled carbon nanotubes. IEEE International Conference on Nanotechnology (IEEE-NANO), Birmingham, UK.
[19] Hruska, J. (2012, January 31). The death of CPU scaling: From one core to many -- and why we're still stuck. ExtremeTech.
[20] Fei Liu, Kang L. Wang, Daihua Zhang, and Chongwu Zhou (2006). Noise in carbon nanotube field effect transistor. Applied Physics Letters, 89(6), 063116..
[21] Novoselov, K. S., Geim, A. K., Morozov, S. V., Jiang, D., Zhang, Y., Dubonos, S. V., Grigorieva, I. V., & Firsov, A. A. (2004). Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films. Science, 306(5696), 666-669.
[22] Novoselov, K. S., Geim, A. K., Morozov, S. V., Jiang, D., Katsnelson, M. I., Grigorieva, I. V., Dubonos, S. V., & Firsov, A. A. (2005). Two-dimensional gas of massless Dirac fermions in graphene. Nature, 438(7065), 197-200.
[23] Zhang, Y., Tan, Y.-W., Stormer, H. L., & Kim, P. (2005). Experimental observation of the quantum Hall effect and Berry's phase in graphene. Nature, 438(7065), 201-204.
[24] Moore, G. E. (1965). Cramming more components onto integrated circuits. Electronics, 38(8), 114-117.